



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,614	09/05/2003	Anthony Robert Wicks	M0274.70033US00	7995

23628 7590 01/25/2006
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLES M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/656,614	Applicant(s) WICKS, ANTHONY ROBERT	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Sep 5, 2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS and application filed on September 5, 2003.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2 and 19 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Examiner has accepted the IDS filed on September 5, 2003.

Drawings

4. The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on September 5, 2003.

Priority

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. UK0220861.9, filed on September 7, 2002.

Claim Objections

6. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim describes a computer-readable device that performs the method of claim 2. It is unclear since the claim is presented in an independent claim format but contains limitations from claim 2. To overcome this objection the applicant should add all the limitations of claim

Art Unit: 2178

2 instead of stating "carrying out a method according to claim 2" into claim 20 which should be an independent claim that describes a computer-readable device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 3, 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims use the word "can be" this type of language should be avoided in the claims since it fails to point out and distinctly claim the invention

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 12-13, 15-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotz (U.S. Pub2004/0034699, filed Aug 16, 2002) in view of Arend (U.S. Pub2003/0229848, filed Aug 30, 2002 with a Provisional date of Jun 5, 2002) further in view of Sangay (NPL, Microsoft Excel 2000: Formatting Colors, has disclosed in IDS 2002) further in view of Excel Printout by Examiner (1999).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Gotz teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying information correlating a list of items and a list of their attributes comprising: displaying the list of items as a column of rows, each row displaying the name of an item in the list of items (See figure 8, numeral 832-842, paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein a list of items are represented by the object instance. Fig 8 shows the list of items such as field value that are displayed in a column of rows and include the name of the value associated with the field name); displaying to the side of the column a set of vertical strips extending the length of the column, each strip being associated with a different attribute of the list of attributes (See figure 8, numeral 844-852, paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein the figure shows a vertical strip that extends to the length of the field name/value columns. In addition the strips are associated to different attribute values such as message/equal/compared and leading data indicators); Although Gotz teach the use of markers for displaying the results of the filtering operation, he fails to include markers in selected positions. Instead Gotz uses the GUI to adjust the filtering options and the program searches the databases to determine if the particular field of data listed is within that database(s) if so an X marker is displayed. Gotz does not teach the actual selection of the filter. However Arend teaches displaying markers in the strips at selected positions where the strips cross rows, said positions being selected in accordance with whether the item named in the crossed row has (or alternatively has not) the attribute associated with that strip (paragraph 34, wherein the user selects the filter button, the table

filtering function is initiated and will sort the table of conditions present in the filter row. Arend teaches the selection of the filter, but Gotz shows the attribute values that are applied to the filter condition); Arend fails to show the extension of the strips. Sangay teaches wherein the strips extend beyond the column of rows of items and have horizontal extensions themselves forming a column of rows, each row displaying the name of an attribute in the list of attributes (page 10/25 and 18/25, See excel printout by examiner, wherein excel includes the functionality for performing the customization of column/rows with attributes. The excel sample shows that the strip extend beyond the column of rows with an associated attribute name in each strip. In addition Excel also has the capability to filter data and with a particular macro program the following customization of column/rows is performed). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the horizontal extension of strips for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the customization of column/rows to provide a more visually appealing configuration for describing the headers of a column. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sangay, excel printout and Arend with Gotz for the benefits of providing the filtering of data by user selection in a less restricting and visually appealing customizable rows/columns for describing the attributes.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, Gotz fails to teach the horizontal extensions of the attribute columns. Sangay teaches wherein the attribute strips have horizontal extensions, a plurality of the horizontal extensions forming a second column of rows, wherein the horizontal extension of each attribute strip includes the first section containing the attribute identifier and the second section containing the filter option indicator (page 10/25 and 18/25, See excel sample by examiner, wherein excel includes the functionality for performing the customization of column/rows with attributes. The excel sample shows that the strip extend beyond the column of rows with an associated attribute name in each strip. In addition Excel also has the capability to filter data and with a particular macro program the following customization of column/rows is performed. Gotz and Arend both show the filtering of the data). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the horizontal extension of strips for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the customization of column/rows to provide a more visually appealing configuration for describing the headers of a column. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sangay, excel printout and Arend with Gotz for the benefits of providing the filtering of data by user selection in a less restricting and visually appealing customizable rows/columns for describing the attributes.

Regarding Dependent claim 13, Gotz shows that each description for the filtering attribute is labeled differently by name. However to further show that each attribute strip is mutually distinct (page 10/25 and 18/25, See excel sample by examiner).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, Gotz teaches wherein seven attribute strips are provided for each page of attributes (paragraph 58).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, Gotz fails to teach the colors associated to the strips. Sangay teaches wherein the seven attribute strips are colored in a rainbow of colors page (10/25 and 18/25, See excel sample by examiner, wherein excel includes the functionality for performing the customization of column/rows with attributes. The excel sample shows that the strip extend beyond the column of rows with an associated attribute name in each strip. Also the different colors with each strip are shown. In addition Excel also has the capability to filter data and with a particular macro program the following customization of column/rows is performed. Gotz and Arend both show the filtering of the data). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the horizontal extension of strips for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the customization of column/rows to provide a more visually appealing configuration for describing the headers of a column. Therefore it would have been obvious to

combine the teachings of Sangay, excel printout and Arend with Gotz for the benefits of providing the filtering of data by user selection in a less restricting and visually appealing customizable rows/columns for describing the attributes.

Regarding Independent claim 19, Gotz teaches a computer-implemented method for displaying a filterable list of items, the method comprising: initializing the first table with attribute names (See figure 8, paragraphs 16, 83 & 84, wherein numeral 844 shows the first table and its attribute name has the header of the column or rows. The filter conditions are user-definable thereby allowing the user to change the header or attribute to any name); generating entries in the second table for each item to be listed (See figure 8, paragraphs 16, 83 & 84, wherein numeral 846 represents the second table and contains several rows forming an attribute column for each data element); displaying the attributes together with the list of items or a subset thereof according to the two tables (See figure 8, paragraphs 16, 83 & 84, wherein the list of data items include the 2 attribute tables in a single data row); Allocating a second table for storing as many elements as there are items to be listed, each element containing a pointer to the item, as well as a flag for each attribute in the first table showing whether the attribute is on or off (See figure 8, paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein numeral 846 represents the second table and includes a column of rows extending the length of the data tables. Each element inherently contains a pointer to the item in the row see numeral 831, where the "x" is associated to that particular row and data

item. Also being in the same row includes the flag from the first attribute table); updating the filtering flags in the first table according to input from the user; updating the attribute flags in the second table according to input from the user; (paragraph 58, wherein the user may define the database operation to insert, **update**, add or delete may be performed to a particular object. Therefore both tables are updated by the user); allocating a first table separately from the items to be listed, each element to contain an attribute name and a flag indicating whether the attribute has been selected for filtering, and if so whether positively or negatively (See figure 8, paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein the first table is represented by numeral 844 and each element of rows is represented by an attribute name. In addition each element includes a flag "x" indicating if the data field exists in a database. Gotz fails to teach the selection of the filter flags including a positive or negative state). Arend teaches the selection of the markers (paragraph 34, wherein the user selects the filter button, the table filtering function is initiated and will sort the table of conditions present in the filter row. Arend teaches the selection of the filter, but Gotz shows the attribute values that are applied to the filter condition). In addition Arend discloses further using this rectangle, where the user is allowed to set the attribute, to accept a mouse click from the user to toggle the attribute on or off for the item (paragraph 34, wherein the user selects the filter button, the table filtering function is initiated and will sort the table of conditions present in the filter row, therefore accepting a mouse click to toggle the filtering function on or off); However Arend fails to show

the extension of the strips. Sangay teaches displaying in each or some of the horizontal colored strips the name of an attribute that the items in the list may possess, as well as an option box to allow filtering of the list on the presence or absence of the attribute; using each rectangle formed by the intersection of a vertical colored strip and a horizontal item row to display a marker if the item possesses the attribute shown in the corresponding horizontal colored strip; displaying the list of items as a column of rows, each row displaying various information pertaining to the item, this column being enclosed by a set of horizontal differently colored strips set one above the other across the top and a matching set of vertical colored strips down one or both sides, each vertical strip forming a right-angle with its correspondingly colored horizontal strip, together forming a rectangular approximation to a rainbow (page 10/25 and 18/25, See excel sample by examiner, wherein excel includes the functionality for performing the customization of column/rows with attributes. The excel sample shows that the strip extend beyond the column of rows with an associated attribute name in each strip. In addition Excel also has the capability to filter data and with a particular macro program the following customization of column/rows is performed. Although the filter isn't explicitly shown in the figure, Gotz and Arend both show the filtering of data); At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the horizontal extension of strips for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the customization of column/rows to provide a more visually appealing

configuration for describing the headers of a column. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Sangay, excel printout and Arend with Gotz for the benefits of providing the filtering of data by user selection in a less restricting and visually appealing customizable rows/columns for describing the attributes.

11. Claims 2-11, 14, 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotz (U.S. Pub2004/0034699, filed Aug 16, 2002) in view of Arend (U.S. Pub2003/0229848, filed Aug 30, 2002 with a Provisional date of Jun 5, 2002).

Regarding Independent claim 2, Gotz teaches a computer-implemented method of managing data elements in a computer system, each data element having at least one associated attribute, the method comprising: storing identifiers of each data element and information identifying the attributes of each data element (paragraph 19, wherein a data collection may include an object instance that is uniquely identified by at least one identifier thereby identifying each data element and information for the attributes of the element. The identifiers are inherently stored within data integrity manager); displaying identifiers associated with each of the data elements in a list as a column of rows, displaying a set of attribute strips extending along at least one side of the column of rows, each attribute strip being associated with a possible attribute for the data element, wherein each attribute strip has a first section containing an identifier of a possible attribute of a data element, a second section comprising a

filter option indicator and wherein each attribute strip further comprises attribute marker sections for each data element (Figure 8, numeral 844-852 and paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein 844-852 represent the strips for displaying the filtering results which extend to the side of the field information represented by the column of rows. Each strip shown in the row of numeral 831 is associated with an attribute for the field information. In addition each strip has a first section described by the header or the attribute that describes the particular column of rows with an identifier such as product_ID shown in numeral 840. 831 also shows the attribute marker section which also includes the filtering shown by the X); displaying a marker in the attribute marker section of each attribute strip if the data element possesses the attribute associated with that attribute strip based on the stored data (Figure 8, numeral 844-852 and paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein a marker "x" is displayed in the filter section of each strip if that element possesses the attribute. For example a database that contains that field value will be indicated with a marker); Gotz also shows that the filter condition is user-definable which include one or more attributes associated with a data collection (paragraphs 14 & 16). Although the filter condition pertains to the filter option, Gotz fails to actually teach the user selecting the option. Arend teaches receiving user input to select at least one filter option (paragraph 42, wherein the user selects the filter button, which includes at least one option thereby activating the filtering function. Therefore the button has an active/inactive state); Storing the selected filter options and displaying the or each corresponding filter option

indicator (paragraphs 33-34, wherein the filtering function is inherently stored and displayed has shown in figure 2 numeral 242); filtering the data elements according to the or each filter option selected by the user (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43); redisplaying the filtered data elements in the column of rows and the associated markers in the attribute marker section of each attribute strip (paragraph 41, wherein the filtered table is indicated by a filter button that is displayed below the table therefore it is inherently redisplayed to indicate to the user that the table has been filtered and displays the associated marker section). Gotz and Arend are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data filtering. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 3, Gotz teaches wherein data elements can be filtered on the presence or on the absence of a selected attribute (See figure 8, wherein the examiner interprets or has either, therefore the figure shows the data

elements that are filtered on the presence of an attribute). Gotz fails to teach the selection of an attribute. However Arend teaches the selection of an attribute from the filter list (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). Gotz and Arend are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data filtering. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 4, Gotz fails to teach the selection of an attribute. Arend teaches wherein the data elements can be filtered using a combination of positively or negatively selected attributes (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). Gotz and Arend are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of data filtering. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been

to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, Gotz discloses storing information indicating whether each data element possesses each attribute (paragraph 58 & 59, wherein the information related to the attribute is inherently stored within the Data Integrity Manager).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, Gotz teaches wherein the attribute marker sections of the attribute strips are provided at the intersection between each attribute strip and each row in the column of rows (See figure 8, wherein the marker sections are formed from the intersection of the attribute column and the data rows).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, Gotz fails to teach the selecting of the attributes. Arend teaches allowing a user to select or deselect an attribute for a data element (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). Gotz and Arend are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of data filtering. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker.

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 8, Gotz fails to teach the selecting of the attributes.

Arend teaches wherein the attributes can be selected or deselected by setting the marker on or off in the attribute marker section at the intersection of the data element row and the attribute column (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 9, Gotz teaches storing a first table separately from the data elements, wherein the table comprises an identifier of each attribute and a filtering flag indicating whether the attribute has been selected for filtering (paragraph 19, wherein a data collection may include an object instance that is uniquely identified by at least one identifier thereby identifying each data element and information for the attributes of the element. The identifiers are inherently stored within data integrity manager). Gotz fails to disclose the selection for filtering. Arend teaches the selecting of the attributes with markers (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 10, Gotz teaches providing a second table for storing information associated with the data elements wherein the table comprises a pointer to each data element and an attribute flag for each attribute

in the first table showing whether the attribute is on or off (See figure 8, paragraphs 83 & 84, wherein numeral 846 represents the second table and includes a column of rows extending the length of the data tables. Each element inherently contains a pointer to the item in the row see numeral 831, where the "x" is associated to that particular row and data item. Also being in the same row includes the flag from the first attribute table).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, Gotz teaches wherein the attribute strips are arranged vertically down at least one side of the column of rows (See figure 8).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, Gotz fails to teach the selection of the attribute strips by user input. Arend teaches providing a plurality of sets of attribute strips associated with a plurality of sets of attributes and providing selection means for a user to select one or more sets of attribute strips to be displayed (paragraphs 33-34, wherein if the filter function is activated then the items are filtered according to the filtering conditions as described in paragraph 43). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the selection of an attribute. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the application of an attribute to a filter by allowing the user to make a selection represented by a marker. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Arend with Gotz for the benefits of allowing the filtering

of data based on specific attributes by letting the user make a selection for applying a filter criterion to the data elements.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, Gotz teaches receiving user input to create a new attribute and assign the new attribute to selected data elements (paragraph 16).

Regarding Dependent claim 18, Gotz teaches wherein identifiers of data elements that are not installed are displayed (paragraph 19).

Regarding Dependent claim 20, the claim is for a computer-readable device performing the method of claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Smith et al. (U.S. Pub 2004/0015470) discloses "Dynamic Filtering In A Database System"
- Mayhew et al. (U.S. 6,694,326) discloses "Graphical Filter Dialog Window System And Method For Same"
- De Vorchik et al. (U.S. 6,279,016) discloses "Standardized Filtering Control Techniques"
- NPL—(Special Edition using Microsoft Excel 97, Ron Person, December 17, 1996)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should


Art Unit: 2178

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

January 19, 2006


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER